

REMARKS

This Amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated July 15, 2003. In the Action, the Examiner: (1) objected to the drawings and specification; (2) rejected claims 1-6, 10, 11, 17 and 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Peterson; (3) rejected claims 1, 7, 10, 12, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson; (4) rejected claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in view of Snyder and Peterson; and (5) rejected claims 15, 16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Dennington. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections and offers the foregoing amendments and following remarks in support thereof.

Claims 1, 10 and 17 have been amended. No new matter has been inserted. Claims 1-24 remain pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Examiner's rejections.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's objection that the drawings submitted for Figures 14-17 introduce new matter into the Application. Drawing figures 14-17 were submitted pursuant to the Examiner's requirement in the last Office Action for drawings showing the pilot chute, canopy and bridle cord connections. Drawing figures 14 through 17 satisfy these requirements by showing portions of common configurations for these well known items (i.e. for pilot chutes, canopies, bridle cords, suspensions lines, etc.). All of these items are generally referenced to in the Specification, and are well known to one having ordinary skill in the art from merely reading Applicant's original Specification. Nothing new to the present

invention is provided by Figures 14 through 17. Furthermore, Applicant is only claiming that the present invention can be used as a connector for pilot chutes, canopies, bridle cords, risers, suspension lines, etc. These items are not part of the invention connector but merely represent items which can be connected by the present invention. Figures 14 through 17 merely emphasize this point. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the current objection to Figures 14 through 17 as allegedly introducing new matter.

The specification has been amended to include a brief description of the drawings for Figures 14-17.

Claims 1-6, 10, 11 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Peterson. Claims 1, 10 and 17 now claim that the attachment of the first end to the second end of the body member defines a single continuous loop attachment area for the body member which is used for connecting the first member to the second member by inserting the continuous loop through the first member and through the second member when connecting the first member to the second member. Peterson fails to teach this feature. Peterson shows at least two distinct attachment areas. Peterson also fails to show a single continuous loop attachment area wherein the single continuous loop is inserted through both the first member and the second member. A single plastic jug is held in the looped end of Peterson. Peterson also fails to provide for a lump as disclosed by Applicant. Applicant also incorporates by reference its previous distinguishing remarks regarding Peterson. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 102(b) rejection based on Peterson.

Claims 1, 7, 10, 12, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson. Applicant incorporates by reference all previous

arguments regarding Calthrop and Peterson, as well as the additional distinguishing arguments regarding the Peterson reference. Neither reference shows a single continuous loop inserted through both the first member and the second member. Furthermore, it is readily apparent that the Peterson device could not replace the specially designed safety spring sling of Calthrop. Applicant respectfully questions whether any one having ordinary skill in the art would consider jumping out of an airplane with a parachute modified to include a strap for holding empty recyclable plastic jugs by eliminating a safety spring sling component. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 7, 10, 12, 17 and 18 under Section 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Calthrop in view of Peterson.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in view of Snyder and Peterson. Applicant's previous comments regarding Booth and Snyder and its above comments regarding Peterson are incorporated by reference. Neither Peterson nor Snyder has any discussion of bridle lines and thus Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statements to the contrary. The invention in Booth is not directed to the attachment of the bridle cord to the pilot chute and canopy. None of the three references show a single continuous loop inserted through the first member and the second member for attaching the first member to the second member. Thus, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Booth in view of Snyder and Peterson.

Claims 15, 16 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Dennington.

Applicant: Bill J. Coe
Serial No. 09/879,419
November 17, 2003
Page 10 of 10

Applicant incorporates by reference it's previous and above arguments regarding Peterson. Neither Peterson nor Dennington show a single continuous loop inserted through the first member and the second member for attaching the first member to the second member. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of claims 15, 16 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Dennington.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is absolutely no motivation, teaching or suggestion in any of the references for any of the Examiner's above proposed Section 103 combinations. Applicant also incorporates its previous arguments as to why several of the cited references are non-analogous art and respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's arguments to the contrary.

Applicant has completely responded to the Office Action dated July 15, 2003.

If there are any additional charges, including extension of time, please bill our Deposit Account No. 13-1130.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel S. Polley, Reg. No. 34,902
Dale Paul DiMaggio, Reg. No. 31,823
Malin, Haley & DiMaggio, P.A.
CUSTOMER No. 22235
1936 South Andrews Ave.
Ft. Lauderdale, Florida 33316
Tel: (954) 763-3303